

REMARKS

In response to the Examiner's objection to the Abstract, it has been shortened to 148 words and to form a single narrative paragraph.

In response to the "double patenting" rejection, please note that claim 12 should depend from claim **10**, not claim **11**. The examiner is requested to make this correction by *Examiner's Amendment*, since only a single penstroke is needed.


In response to Paragraph 1 on page 4 of the Action, since the HORNG patent is not an effective reference and HSIEH alone concededly fails to teach or suggest all of the features of claims 9, 13, 14, 17, 18, 22-23, and 26-28, the section 103 rejection of those claims should be reconsidered. On page 5, the Examiner has conceded that "HSIEH does not disclose a spacer."

In response to Paragraph 2 on page 6 of the Action, the rejection of claim 10 relied on combining HSIEH, HORNG and STONE; since HORNG cannot be relied upon, this section 103 rejection should also be reconsidered.

In response to Paragraph 3 on page 6 of the Action, the rejection of claims 11-12, 15-16, 20-21 and 24-25 relied upon combining HSIEH with HORNG and KULL. Since neither HORNG nor KULL is an effective reference, this section 103 rejection should also be reconsidered.

The application is now in condition for allowance. If the Examiner notes any remaining informalities, or wishes to make any suggestions, he is invited to telephone the undersigned. No extension fee is believed necessary for this submission; if any **is** needed, please charge our Deposit Account 23-0442.

Respectfully submitted,



Milton Oliver, Reg. # 28,333
Cust. No. 4955